

Appl. No. 09/195,333  
Amdt. Dated April 11, 2005  
Reply to Office action of January 10, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P10149-US1  
EUS/J/P/05-3085

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings include changes to Fig. 2.

A Submittal of Drawing Replacement Sheet(s) is being filed concurrently herewith under a separate cover. For your convenience, a copy of that filing is attached.

Attachment: Copy of Submittal of Drawing Replacement Sheets

Appl. No. 09/195,333  
Amdt. Dated April 11, 2005  
Reply to Office action of January 10, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P10149-US1  
EUS/J/P/05-3085

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

#### **Claim Amendments**

The Applicant has canceled claims 1-20; claims 21-39 have been added. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 21-39 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### **Examiner Objections – Drawings**

The Drawings were objected to because Figure 2 should be designated by a legend such as –Prior Art–. In response, the Applicant is submitting a “formal” replacement sheet. The Examiner's approval of these drawings is respectfully requested.

#### **Examiner Objections – Specification**

The specification was objected to because of several informalities. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful review of the specification. In response, the Applicant has modified the specification as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner's consideration of the amendments to the specification is respectfully requested.

#### **Examiner Objections - Claims**

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 9 were objected to because of informalities. Again, the Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the claims. The Applicant has canceled claims 1-20 and added new claims 21-39. The Examiner's consideration of the new claims is respectfully requested.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-6, 8-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Vaio (US 6,721,752). In order to expedite allowance of this application,

Appl. No. 09/195,333  
Amdt. Dated April 11, 2005  
Reply to Office action of January 10, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P10149-US1  
EUS/J/P/05-3085

the Applicant has canceled claims 1-20 without prejudice. The Examiner's consideration of the new claims is respectfully requested.

The Vaios reference appears to disclose a security system using the Internet and the public telephone network. The system allows multi-remote access of an area utilizing installed surveillance devices that are interfaced with the Internet. One feature of the system utilizes movement detection to automatically notify an end user of the status of the system. The system also allows use of a remote computer system to obtain additional information and control an installed video camera.

Vaios discloses sending a notification of movement detected in the surveillance area via beeper, phone call or email message. The conversion process disclosed in the Vaios reference is for converting from one computer protocol to another computer protocol. In the Applicant's invention, the conversion/encapsulation is for converting/providing a means for the emergency call center to receive an IP generated emergency message over the Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN). Additionally, the emergency message is not automatically generated. For instance, the "emergency" call disclosed by Vaios is an automatic notification of detecting a movement, the notification being sent to an individual via beeper, phone call or email. In contrast, the emergency message in the Applicant's invention is that of an individual sending a message to an emergency call center.

The individual that will receive the automatic notification knows the location of the surveillance area in Vaios. However, the emergency call center must be notified of the caller's physical location, since the call is probably from an individual that never before made an emergency call. Additionally, since there is currently an effort to find a way to use IP to call the local 911 emergency call center encapsulating or/and converting an IP formatted emergency call to readable 911 emergency calls is very important. The emergency call center does not have every location mapped, as in Vaios. What is different about the Applicant's invention is that the physical address and phone number of an unknown caller is determined from the ISP database using the IP address determined from the IP address of the emergency call, The information associated with

Appl. No. 09/195,333  
Amdt. Dated April 11, 2005  
Reply to Office action of January 10, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P10149-US1  
EUS/J/P/05-3085

the IP address is converted/encapsulated and made available to the emergency call center.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-9 and 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention. Claims 1-20 have been cancelled and claims 21-39 have been added.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claims 7 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaio in view of LeBlanc (US 5,596,625). Claims 1-20 have been canceled.

#### **Prior Art Not Relied Upon**

In paragraph 15 on page 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure.

Appl. No. 09/195,333  
Amdt. Dated April 11, 2005  
Reply to Office action of January 10, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P10149-US1  
EUS/J/P/05-3085

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application are in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford  
Registration No. 45,602

Date: April 11, 2005

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656  
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com